Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 12/16/11

arXiv:1612.02688v1 [astro-ph.GA] 8 Dec 2016

SEARCH FOR INTERSTELLAR MONOHYDRIC THIOLS

Prasanta Gorai[1], Ankan Das[1], Amaresh Das[2,1], Bhalamurugan Sivaraman[3], Emmanuel E. Etim[4,5], Sandip K. Chakrabarti[6,1]

[1]Indian Centre for Space Physics, 43 Chalantika, Garia Station Rd., Kolkata, 700084, India
[2] Ramakrishna Mission Residential College, Narendrapur, Kolkata 700103, West Bengal, India
[3] Atomic Molecular and Optical Physics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad, 380009, India
[4] Indian Institute of Science Bangalore, India-560012
[5] Department of Chemical Sciences, Federal University Wukari, Nigeria and
[6] S.N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences, Salt Lake, Kolkata, 700106, India

ABSTRACT

It has been pointed out by various astronomers that very interesting relationship exists between interstellar alcohols and the corresponding thiols (sulfur analogue of alcohols) as far as the spectroscopic properties and chemical abundances are concerned. Monohydric alcohols such as methanol and ethanol are widely observed and 1-propanol is recently claimed to have been seen in Orion KL. Among the monohydric thiols, methanethiol (chemical analogue of methanol), has been firmly detected in Orion KL and Sgr B2(N2) and ethanethiol (chemical analogue of ethanol) has been claimed to be observed in Sgr B2(N2) though the confirmation of this detection is yet to come. It is very likely that higher order thiols could be observed in these regions. In this paper, we study the formation of monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues. Based on our quantum chemical calculation and chemical modeling, we find that 'Tg' conformer of 1-propanethiol is a good candidate of astronomical interest. We present various spectroscopically relevant parameters of this molecule to assist its future detection in the Interstellar medium (ISM).

Subject headings: Astrochemistry, spectra, ISM: molecules, ISM: abundances, ISM: evolution, methods: numerical

1. INTRODUCTION

Starting from the detection of first carbon containing molecule, methylidyne radical (CH) in 1937 (Swings & Rosenfield 1937), almost 200 molecules including neutrals, radicals and ions have been observed in the interstellar medium or circumstellar shells and almost 60 molecules have been observed in comets. A mismatch between the cosmic abundance of sulfur and observed abundances of S-bearing species is well known (Palumbo et al. 1997). Particularly around the dense cloud regions, this inequality is severe (Tieftrunk et al. 1994; Palumbo et al. 1997). Around the diffuse cloud and highly ionized regions, sulfur related species roughly resemble the cosmic abundance $\sim 10^{-5}$ (Savage & Sembach 1996; Howk et al. 2006). Earlier, Millar & Herbst (1990); Jansen et al. (1995) suggested that S, SO, CS and H_2S may explain the missing sulfur problem though our knowledge about the CS related species is very limited. Recently Müller et al. (2015) suggested that at 400 K more than 50% of the sulfur budget is shared by CS and H_2CS and remainder resides in the form of SO and SO_2 for hot source Sgr B2(N). Several experiments were carried out to propose the abundant S-bearing species on interstellar grains. Outcome of these experiments proposed that OCS (Garozzo et al. 2010), CS_2 (Ferrante et al. 2008), hydrated sulfuric acid (Scappini et al. 2003) would act as a sink for the interstellar sulfur. Till date, only two sulfur related molecules (OCS and SO_2) had been detected on grain surface with full confidence thus the exact reservoir of sulfur is yet to be known with certainty (Wood et al. 2015; Palumbo et al. 1995; Boogert et al. 1997).

Among the monohydric alcohols, methanol (CH_3OH) is the simplest alcohol which is widely observed both in gas and solid phases (Tielend & Allamandola 1987) of the ISM. Major portion of the interstellar grain mantle is found to be covered with methanol (Gibb et al. 2004; Das et al. 2008a; Das, Acharyya & Chakrabarti 2010; Das & Chakrabarti 2011; Das et al. 2016). Gas phase abundance of methanol relative to H_2 is found to be in the range of 10^{-9} in cold dark clouds to 10^{-6} in hot molecular cores (Charnley et al. 1995). The presence of Ethanol (C_2H_5OH) (second alcohol in this homologous series) is observed in star-forming regions in the range of $10^{-8} - 10^{-6}$ (Millar et al. 1988; Turner 1991). Propanol is the next alcohol in the series of monohydric alcohols which may belong in two different forms: normal(n)-propanol ($CH_3CH_2CH_2OH$) and 2-propanol ($CH_3CHOHCH_3$). Recently n-propanol (1-propanol) was claimed to be detected towards Orion KL by Tercero et al. (2015) with a column density of $\leqslant (1.0 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{15})$ cm^{-2} whereas the presence of 2-propanol is yet to be verified.

It is now confirmed that methanol and ethanol are mainly produced on dust grains during the cold phase and evaporate from warm dust grains in latter stages of evolution. Following this trend, even higher order alcohols would be produced on interstellar grains. In case of thiols, sulfur takes the place of oxygen in the hydroxyl group of an alcohol. Similar to their alcohol analogues, these thiols are mainly produced on the grain surface and are evaporated in suitable time. Tentative detection of Methanethiol (CH_3SH) in Sgr B2 had been done by Turner (1977). Later this

[1]ankan.das@gmail.com

claim had been confirmed by Linke et al. (1979) and showed that CH_3SH/CH_3OH ratio is close to the cosmic S/O ratio. Recently, Majumdar et al. (2016) detected CH_3SH in IRAS 16293-2422 and Kolesniková et al. (2014) reported the detection of C_2H_5SH in hot core Orion KL. But very recent observation by Müller et al. (2015) suggested that the detection of C_2H_5SH in Orion KL is uncertain. Presence of higher order thiols are yet to be seen.

In this paper, we discuss the formation of monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues. First, we identify the most stable conformer of alcohols and their thiols. Then we develop a chemical network to study the formation of all these species. From the outcome of our chemical modeling, most probable new candidate for the astronomical detection is found out. Moreover, a detailed spectroscopic study is carried out to set a guideline for observing this species in near future. This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the quantum chemical calculation to find out the most stable conformers; Section 3 contains chemical modeling; Section 4 contains the information regarding the spectroscopic parameters for the detection of the next probable candidate; Finally in Section 5, we make concluding remarks.

2. SEARCH FOR MOST STABLE CONFORMATIONAL ISOMERS

All the quantum chemical calculations reported here are calculated by using Gaussian 09 program (Frisch et al. 2009; Foresman & Frisch 1996). Each optimized structure is verified by avoiding the imaginary frequency. With the advance of quantum chemical calculation a proper choice of Method and basis sets are required to compute the molecular properties.

According to IUPAC definition of a conformer, conformational isomerism is a form of stereo isomerism in which the isomers can be inter-converted exclusively by rotations about formally single bonds. It is expected that the most stable conformer would be the most probable candidate for the astronomical detection. In this attempt, here, before constructing our chemical model, we search for the various conformers of the monohydric alcohols and their thiols through relaxed potential energy surface (PES) scan of dihedral angles. PES scan results are displayed in Fig. 1 and relative energies of the conformers are pointed out in Table 1. 2-propanol/2-propanethiol is the structural isomer of 1-propanol/1-propanethiol, for the sake of completeness, we discuss about their conformers as well. For all these calculation, we use Møller-Plesset perturbation theory (MP2) with the Peterson and Dunning's correlation consistent basis set (cc-pVTZ) (Peterson & Dunning 2002) of Gaussian 09 software. Results of the PES scans are the following.

2.1. *Methanol & methanethiol*

Methanol and methanethiol both show internal rotation of CH_3 group. From relaxed potential energy surface scan ($-180°$ to $+180°$ of dihedral angle $\angle(H_3, C_1, O_6, H_5)$), we have shown that methanol and methanethiol both exist in the most stable state at $\pm$ 180° of the dihedral angle on PES. On the other hand, there exist three different maxima for both methanol and methanethiol at $\pm$ 120° and at 0°. Relative energies are pointed out in Table 1.

2.2. *Ethanol & ethanethiol*

In case of ethanol and ethanethiol, both have two types of internal rotation: around OH/SH group and CH_3 group. Due to internal rotation of the OH/SH group of ethanol/ethanethiol, it may exist in four different forms. For ethanol, trans/anti conformation (dihedral angle $\angle(C_1, C_5, O_8, H_9)$ =180°) is the minimum energy state on PES. The gauche conformer (dihedral angle $\angle(C_1, C_5, O_8, H_9) = \pm 60°$) is situated slightly upper on the PES. The relative energy between the trans and gauche conformer is 0.877 cm^{-1}. When the dihedral angle is $\pm$ 120°, conformers are called eclipsed. The relative energy between trans and eclipsed conformer is 415 cm^{-1}. When the dihedral angle is 0°, it is called cis conformer which is also situated at higher energy state on the PES. The relative energy between trans and cis conformer is 456 cm^{-1} (1.3 Kcal/mol). Whereas for ethanethiol the most stable conformer is gauche in which $\angle(C_1, C_5, S_8, H_9)$ dihedral angle is at $\pm$ 60°. Relative energy between gauche and trans conformer is 170 cm^{-1} (0.49 Kcal/mol), relative energy between gauche and eclipsed conformer is 524 cm^{-1} (1.50 Kcal/mol) and the relative energy between gauche and cis conformer is 541 cm^{-1} (1.55 Kcal/mol). Due to CH_3 rotation, there would also be some changes in the energy between the conformers but all are higher as compared to the most stable one.

2.3. *1-propanol and 1-propanethiol*

Maeda et al. (2006) discussed five possible conformational isomers of 1-propanol originating from alternate structure of the central (C_1, C_5, O_8, H_9) and (O_8, C_5, C_1, H_3) skeletal chains. These five forms are $Trans-trans$ (Tt), $Trans-gauche$ (Tg), $Gauche-trans$ (Gt), $Gauche-gauche$ (Gg) and $Gauche-gauche^{'}$ $(Gg^{'})$. Based on the relative energies of these conformers, Abdurakhmanov & Ismailzade (1987) find out that Tg conformer has the lowest energy. However Lotta et al. (1984); Kisiel et al. (2010) predicted that Gt conformer has the lowest energy. Our quantum chemical study also finds that Gt conformer has the lowest energy. As in earlier studies, in terms of their relative energies, we found that 1-propanol conformer follows the sequence of Gt, $Gg^{'}$, Gg, Tg, Tt in the ascending order of relative energies.

Similar studies have been carried out for 1-propanethiol. Since 1-propanethiol is yet to be detected in the ISM, perspective views of its five possible staggered conformers, originating from the combination of *trans* and *gauche* configuration is shown in Fig. 2. Our calculation reveals that Tg configuration has the lowest energies. Relative energies of all the conformers with respect to the Tg conformer are shown in Table 1.



FIG. 1.— Relaxed potential energy surface scan of dihedral angle of monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues using MP2/cc-pVTZ level of theory.

TABLE 1
Relative energies of various conformers of alcohols and their thiol analogues

Species	Conformer	ΔE in cm^{-1} (Kcal/mol)
Methanol	HCOH ± 180°	0 (0)
	HCOH ± 60°	0.4389 (0.0013)
	HCOH 120°	395 (1.13)
	HCOH 0°	395 (1.13)
Methanethiol	HCSH ± 180°	0 (0)
	HCSH ± 60°	0.877 (0.0025)
	HCSH ± 120°	445 (1.27)
	HCSH 0°	445 (1.27)
Ethanol	*trans*	0 (0)
	gauche	23 (0.066)
	eclipsed	415 (1.19)
	cis	456 (1.30)
Ethanethiol	*gauche* CCSH	0 (0)
	trans CCSH	170.0 (0.49)
	eclipsed	524.0 (1.50)
	cis	541 (1.55)
1-propanol	Gt	0 (0)
	Gg	67 (0.19)
	Gg'	3.5 (0.01)
	Tt	95 (0.27)
	Tg	80 (0.23)
1-propanethiol	Tg	0 (0)
	Tt	216 (0.62)
	Gt	318 (0.91)
	Gg'	63 (0.18)
	Gg	46 (0.13)
2-propanol	*gauche*	0 (0)
	trans	83.6 (0.24)
2-propanethiol	*trans*	0 (0)
	gauche	12 (0.034)



Fig. 2.— Five possible conformers of 1-propanethiol.

2.4. *2-propanol and 2-propanethiol*

Depending on the rotation of the dihedral angle $\angle(H_{10}, C_9, O_{11}, H_{12})/\angle(H_{10}, C_9, S_{11}, H_{12})$, 2-propanol/2-propanethiol may exist in two forms; *gauche* and *trans*. *gauche* conformer is found to be stable for 2-propanol whereas, in case of 2-propanethiol, *trans* conformer is found to be stable. Since 2-propanol/2-propanethiol is a secondary alcohol/thiol, we are not considering this in our chemical modeling.

3. CHEMICAL MODELING

TABLE 2
Ice phase production of alcohols and their corresponding thiols

Reaction	Energy Barrier (K)	Reference
Methanol		
$H + CO \rightarrow HCO$	1000	H
$H + CO \rightarrow HOC$	1000	H
$H + HCO \rightarrow H_2CO$	0	H
$H + HOC \rightarrow CHOH$	0	H
$CH + OH \rightarrow CHOH$	0	H
$H + H_2CO \rightarrow HCO + H_2$	1850	H
$H + CHOH \rightarrow CH_2OH$	0	H
$OH + CH_2 \rightarrow CH_2OH$	0	H
$O + CH_3 \rightarrow CH_2OH$	0	H
$H + CH_2OH \rightarrow CH_3OH$	0	H
Methanethiol		
$H + CS \rightarrow HCS$	1000	H
$H + HCS \rightarrow H_2CS$	0	H
$H + H_2CS \rightarrow CH_3S$	1000	M
$S + CH_3 \rightarrow CH_3S$	0	
$H + H_2CS \rightarrow HCS + H2$	1000	M
$H + H_2CS \rightarrow CH_2SH$	1000	M
$CH_2 + HS \rightarrow CH_2SH$	0	
$H + CH_3S \rightarrow CH_3SH$	0	M
$H + CH_2SH \rightarrow CH_3SH$		
Ethanol		
$C_2H_5 + OH \rightarrow C_2H_5OH$	0	H
$CH_2OH + CH_3 \rightarrow C_2H_5OH$	0	
$C_2H_5 + O \rightarrow C_2H_5O$	0	
$H + C_2H_5O \rightarrow C_2H_5OH$	0	
Ethanethiol		
$C_2H_5 + HS \rightarrow C_2H_5SH$	0	M
$CH_2SH + CH_3 \rightarrow C_2H_5SH$	0	M
$S + C_2H_5 \rightarrow C_2H_5S$	0	M
$H + C_2H_5S \rightarrow C_2H_5SH$	0	M
$CH_3 + CH_3S \rightarrow C_2H_5SH$	0	
1-propanol($CH_3CH_2CH_2OH$)		
$C_2H + H_2O \rightarrow HCCCHO + H$	0	
$O + C_3H_3 \rightarrow HCCCHO + H$	0	
$H + HCCCHO \rightarrow HCCHCHO$	1688	
$H + HCCHCHO \rightarrow H_2CCHCHO$	0	
$H + H_2CCHCHO \rightarrow CH_2CH_2CHO$	2891	
$H + CH_2CH_2CHO \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CHO$	0	
$H + CH_3CH_2CHO \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2O$	2274	
$H + CH_3CH_2CH_2O \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2OH$	0	
$C_2H_5 + CH_2OH \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2OH$	0	
1-propanethiol($CH_3CH_2CH_2SH$)		
$C_2H + H_2S \rightarrow HCCCHS + H$	0	
$S + C_3H_3 \rightarrow HCCCHS + H$	0	
$H + HCCCHS \rightarrow HCCHCHS$	2167	
$H + HCCHCHS \rightarrow H_2CCHCHS$	0	
$H + H_2CCHCHS \rightarrow CH_2CH_2CHS$	2659	
$H + CH_2CH_2CHS \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CHS$		
$H + CH_3CH_2CHS \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2S$	734	
$H + CH_3CH_2CH_2S \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2SH$	0	
$C_2H_5 + CH_2SH \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2SH$	0	

^{H} reaction taken from Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung (1992), ^{M} reaction taken from Müller et al. (2015)

3.1. *Chemical network*

For the purpose of chemical modeling, we use our large gas-grain chemical network (Das et al. 2008b, 2013a,b). Gas-grain interactions are considered to mimic the most realistic scenario of the ISM. We assume that gas and grains are coupled through accretion and various desorption mechanisms such as thermal, non-thermal (Garrod & Herbst 2006) and cosmic-ray desorption processes. Our present gas phase chemical network consist of 6628 reactions between 684 gas phase species and surface chemical network consists of 487 reactions between 316 surface species. We adopt our gas phase chemical network from the UMIST 2006 database (Woodall et al. 2007). Our gas phase network contains some deuterated reactions as well (Das et al. 2015a,b; Sahu et al. 2015). For the grain surface reaction network, we primarily follow Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung (1992) and for the ice phase deuterium fractionation reactions, we follow Caselli et al. (2002); Cazaux et al. (2010); Das et al. (2016). Though we have the deuterated species in our network, we are not considering the deuterium chemistry here for the sake of simplicity.

Here, we are mainly concentrating on the formation of monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues. These molecules are mainly formed on the dust surface. Chemical enrichment of the interstellar grain mantle depends on the binding energies (E_d) and barriers against diffusion (E_b) of the adsorbed species. The binding energies of these species are available from past studies (Allen & Robinson 1977; Tielens & Allamandola 1987; Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung 1992; Hasegawa & Herbst 1993). But these binding energies mostly pertain to silicates. Binding energy of the most important surface species (with ice) which are mostly controlling the chemical composition of the interstellar grain mantle are available from some recent studies (Cuppen & Herbst 2007; Garrod 2013). We use these energies in our model. For the rest of the species for which binding energies were unavailable from these papers, we keep it the same as the past studies. We use binding energies against diffusion equal to $0.5E_d$ (Garrod 2013) for our calculations.

TABLE 3
Peak abundance of ice phase alcohols and their thiols with respect to H nuclei in all forms.

	Isothermal phase		Warm-up phase	
Species	**gas phase**	**ice phase**	**gas phase (temp in K)**	**ice phase (temp in K)**
Methanol	1.75×10^{-9}	2.12×10^{-5}	6.98×10^{-6}(106.0)	1.86×10^{-5}(10.24)
Ethanol	8.38×10^{-11}	4.66×10^{-11}	1.26×10^{-6}(120.2)	2.00×10^{-6}(71.4)
1-propanol	6.45×10^{-20}	1.84×10^{-17}	4.29×10^{-7}(120.6)	4.76×10^{-7}(106.1)
Methanethiol	1.06×10^{-10}	1.62×10^{-8}	2.16×10^{-8}(107.3)	4.58×10^{-8}(31.2)
Ethanethiol	3.04×10^{-22}	5.23×10^{-20}	5.45×10^{-9}(120.0)	1.02×10^{-8}(66.2)
1-propanethiol	2.94×10^{-27}	6.00×10^{-25}	3.71×10^{-10}(122.7)	3.73×10^{-10}(108.4)

TABLE 4
Molecular ratio of some species

	after 1.0×10^6 years	**after 1.5×10^6 years**	**after 2.0×10^6 years**	**Observed**
$\frac{CH_3OH}{C_2H_5OH}$	2663	1879	3.24	45^t,78^{m1}
$\frac{CH_3OH}{CH_3CH_2CH_2OH}$	2.08×10^9	3485	7.79	2700^t
$\frac{C_2H_5OH}{CH_3CH_2CH_2OH}$	773843	1.85	2.40	60^t
$\frac{CH_3SH}{C_2H_5SH}$	2.61×10^{11}	708	4.55	$\geq 21^m$,3.1^{m1}
$\frac{CH_3OH}{CH_3SH}$	2.69	344.3	112.7	120^m, 5700^{m1}
$\frac{C_2H_5OH}{C_2H_5SH}$	2.62×10^8	129	157	125^m,225^{m1}

^{m}Müller et al. (2015) from observation, ^{m1}Müller et al. (2015) from modeling, ^{t}Tercero et al. (2015) from observation,

Our ice phase network contains other reactions mentioned in Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung (1992). In Table 2, we have shown only some grain phase reactions which may lead to the formation of these alcohols and their thiol analogues. Druard & Wakelam (2012) shows that chemistry of sulfur may be very different from the chemistry of other chemical elements. They considered sulfur polymers (S_n) and polysulphanes (H_2S_n) as the potential candidates of the sulfur refractory residue. Here, we have considered all the sulfur related reactions used in Druard & Wakelam (2012). For the formation of Methanol, we use the pathways proposed by Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung (1992). Methanethiol production is followed by Müller et al. (2015). For the ethanol production, we assume barrier-less addition between C_2H_5 and OH radical (Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung 1992), CH_2OH and CH_3 radical and hydrogenation reaction with C_2H_5O. For the production of Ethanethiol, we use the pathways proposed by Müller et al. (2015). Reaction references are also noted in Table 2. Since for the formation of 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol, no pathways were available, we use some new pathways for the formation of these species in ice phase. For the formation of the 1-propanol, we have considered two radical-molecular ice phase reactions followed by 4 successive hydrogen addition reactions. Similar sequence is also considered for the formation of 1-propanethiol. In addition, we also have considered the radical radical reaction between C_2H_5 and CH_2OH for the formation of 1-propanol and radical-radical reaction between C_2H_5 and CH_2SH for the formation of 1-propanethiol. As like the other radical-molecular reactions considered in Hasegawa, Herbst & Leung (1992), here also, we are assuming the barrier-less nature of these reactions. Rate coefficients of this type of reactions thus depend upon the adopted adsorption energies and would process in each encounter. Among the four successive hydrogen addition reactions considered here, hydrogen addition reaction in second and fourth steps of 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol would be considered as radical-radical interaction and thus barrierless in nature. But the first and third steps of this sequence is the neutral-neutral reaction which must contain some activation barrier. We have carried out quantum chemical calculation to find out suitable transition states for these neutral-neutral reactions. QST2 calculation with B3LYP/6-31+G(d) method is employed for this computation and obtained activation barriers for these neutral-neutral reactions are pointed out in the second column of Table 2. Though 2-propanol and 2-propanethiol are the structural isomers of 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol respectively, we are not considering their formation in the present study. For the destruction of ice phase species, we consider the photo-dissociation reactions by direct interstellar photons and cosmic ray induced photons.

We do not use any new gas phase formation of these species. In our model, gas and grains are continuously interacting with each other and exchanging their chemical components. Surface species could populate the gas phase by various evaporation mechanism considered here namely; thermal desorption, cosmic ray induced desorption and reactive non-thermal desorption (here, we assume a non-thermal desorption factor to be 0.01). For the destruction of gas phase alcohols and their corresponding thiols, we use destruction by most abundant ions (H_3^+, CH_4^+, C^+, HCO^+, N^+, O^+, H_3O^+, CH^+, $O2^+$, H^+, He^+, CH_3^+), dissociative recombination, photo-dissociation and dissociation by cosmic rays.

3.2. *Physical condition*

In order to realistically model the physical parameters, we consider a warm-up model (Quan et al. 2016). Initial phase of this model is the isothermal phase (T = 10 K) followed by a warm-up phase. Both phases have the same

constant density ($n_H = 10^4$ cm^{-3}) and a visual extinction of 10. Second phase starts with 10 K and ends at 200 K. Here, it is assumed that the isothermal phase lasts for 10^6 years and the warm-up phase for another 10^6 years. Initial abundances are taken from Druard & Wakelam (2012) except the sulfur abundance. Druard & Wakelam (2012) considered abundance of S^+ in its cosmic value $\sim 1.5 \times 10^{-5}$ (Sofia et al. 1994). Here, we are assuming much reduced S^+ abundance (8.0×10^{-8}) as used in Leung, Herbst & Huebner (1984). Hydrogens are mostly assumed to be in the form of molecular hydrogen. These molecular hydrogens were mainly formed on the dust surfaces (Biham et al. 2001; Chakrabarti et al. 2006a,b) in earlier stages. For the ionization of the medium, we assume a cosmic ray ionization rate of 1.3×10^{-17} s^{-1}.

3.3. *Modeling results*

In Fig. 3, we have shown the time evolution of gas phase (solid curve) and ice phase (dotted curve) alcohols and their thiol analogues. Upper panel shows the isothermal phase and lower panel shows the warm-up phase. In the isothermal phase, it is clear that ice phase methanol, ethanol and methanethiol are efficiently produced. Some portions of these abundant ice phase species is readily transfered to the gas phase via various desorption mechanisms. At the beginning of the warm-up phase, ice phase production of ethanol, ethanethiol, 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol increases due to the increase in the mobility of the surface species involved in the reactions. In Table 3, we have pointed out the peak abundances of these alcohols and their thiol analogues for both the phases. In the warm-up phase, peak abundances of these species along with the temperatures related to these peak values are also pointed out.

It is fascinating to indicate from Table 3 that among all the species shown in Table 3, methanol is the only one which is most efficiently produced in the isothermal ($T = 10$ K) phase compare to the warm-up phase. Its peak ice phase abundance in isothermal phase is found to be 2.12×10^{-5} with respect to total H nuclei whereas in the warm-up phase, its peak abundance of 1.86×10^{-5} is appearing around 10.24 K. In compare to the isothermal phase, abundances of the other ice phase species are seemed to be significantly higher in the warm-up phase. For example, peak abundance of ice phase methanethiol appears around 31 K, production ethanol and ethanethiol is found to be efficient around $66 - 71$ K and efficient production of 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol is found to be around $106 - 108$ K. Formation of ethanol, ethanethiol, 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol at such high temperatures occurs mainly due to the radical radical reactions. It is essential to point out that adopted adsorption energies of some of these key radicals (CH_3, C_2H_5, OH, SH, CH_2OH, CH_2SH are 1175 K, 2110 K, 2850 K, 1500 K, 5080 K, 5084 K) available from some earlier studies (Garrod 2013; Cuppen & Herbst 2007; Hasegawa & Herbst 1993).

Since, we are mainly considering the ice phase production of these species, appearance of the peak gas phase abundance is highly related to their respective adsorption energies. For example, in case of methanol and methanethiol, we have assumed the adsorption energy 5530 K and 5534 K respectively and from Table 3, the resulting peak gas phase abundances of methanol and methanethiol seems around $106 - 107$ K. For the ethanol, ethanethiol, propanol and 1-propanethiol much higher adsorption energies are assumed (6260 K, 6230 K, 6260 K and 6260 K for ethanol, ethanethiol, 1-propanol and 1-propanethiol respectively) which ensures the peak gas phase abundance of these species around $120 - 123$ K.

In Table 4, we have shown molecular ratio (gas phase) of these alcohols and their thiol analogue. Since, chemical evolution is highly time dependent phenomenon, ratios are shown for various time scales. 1.0×10^6 years corresponds to the end of the isothermal phase, 1.5×10^6 years corresponds to the middle age of the warm-up phase and 2.0×10^6 years is related to the end of the warm-up phase. Gas phase ratio of the observed and other modeling results are also shown. Gas phase observational ratios are taken from Tercero et al. (2015) and Müller et al. (2015) whereas hot core modeling results is taken from Müller et al. (2015). It is interesting to note that around the isothermal phase, gas phase abundance of methanol, methanethiol and ethanol is in the range of $10^{-9} - 10^{-11}$ whereas the gas phase abundances of other species is negligible which yields a much higher molecular ratios of some species. Beyond 1.0×10^6 years, mobility of the surface species rapidly increases and yields significant production of negligible species. At the end of warm-up phase, we are having a reasonable values of these ratios.

4. SPECTROSCOPY

4.1. *Vibrational Spectroscopy*

Our results suggest that 1-propanethiol would be a probable candidate for the astronomical detection. Here we calculate the IR spectrum of 1-propanethiol for the sake of completeness. Moreover, vibrational spectral information of its one structural isomer, 2-propanethiol is also presented. In Table 5, we assigned different modes of vibrations along with frequency and intensity of these species. Ice phase absorbance is shown in terms of integral absorption coefficient in cm molecule^{-1}. We compare our results with the existing experimental results. Gaussian 09 program is used for all these calculations. Water is used as a solvent to compute vibrational spectroscopy using Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM) with the integral equation formalism variant (IEFPCM) as a default Self-consistent Reaction Field (SCRF) method. IEFPCM model is considered to be a convenient one because the second derivative of energy with respect to coordinate (bond distance, bond angle) is available for this model and also its analytic form is available. For this computations, we use DFT method with B3LYP functional and higher order basis set 6-311g++(2df,2pd) (Choi et al. 2008) for better accuracy. A comparison between our calculated IR spectrum band with the existing experimental results of 1- proapnethiol and 2-propanethiol (Torgrimsen & Klaeboe 1970; Smith et al. 1968) are shown in Table 5. It is clear from the table that our results are in excellent agreement with the existing experimental values. Most intense band of 1-propanethiol appears at 3.23 μm (3091.47 cm^{-1}) and 3.24 μm (3085.19 cm^{-1}) due to CH_3 and CH_2

TABLE 5
VIBRATIONAL FREQUENCIES OF 1-PROPANETHIOL AND 2-PROPANETHIOL IN WATER ICE PHASE AT B3LYP/6-311G++(2DF,2PD) METHOD AND BASIS SET

Species	**Peak position in cm^{-1} (in μm)**	**Integral absorbance coefficient in cm $molecule^{-1}$**	**Band assignment**	**experimental values wavenumber (in cm^{-1})**
1-propanethiol (Tg)	112.38 (88.98)	2.30×10^{-19}	skeletal deformation	
	191.24 (52.29)	3.07×10^{-18}	SH torsion	
	231.45 (43.20)	8.92×10^{-20}	CH_3 torsion	
	243.06 (41.14)	1.07×10^{-18}	CH_3 torsion	
	358.01 (27.93)	5.51×10^{-20}	CCC bending	
	693.54 (14.41)	1.69×10^{-18}	CS stretching	700[a]
	733.09 (13.64)	1.19×10^{-18}	CH_2 rocking	728[a]
	805.20 (12.41)	8.53×10^{-19}	SH out of plane bending	814[a]
	896.45 (11.15)	1.06×10^{-18}	CH_3 bending/CC stretching	
	922.64 (10.83)	3.01×10^{-19}	CH_2 twisting	
	1031.61 (9.69)	7.72×10^{-20}	CC stretching	
	1098.01 (9.10)	6.91×10^{-19}	CH_2 rocking	
	1128.58 (8.86)	2.17×10^{-18}	CC stretching	1105[a]
	1252.95 (7.98)	9.61×10^{-19}	CH_2 twisting	1243[a]
	1280.52 (7.80)	3.49×10^{-18}	CH_2 wagging	1300[a]
	1322.96 (7.55)	1.82×10^{-19}	CH_2 twisting	
	1365.78 (7.32)	2.40×10^{-19}	CH_2 wagging	1351[a]
	1407.51 (7.10)	4.15×10^{-19}	CH_3 out of plane bending	1384[a]
	1465.93 (6.82)	5.36×10^{-19}	CH_2 scissoring	1456[a]
	1482.97 (6.74)	1.76×10^{-19}	CH_2 scissoring	
	1489.36 (6.71)	1.71×10^{-18}	CH_3 deformation	
	1502.89 (6.65)	2.11×10^{-18}	CH_2 scissoring	
	2666.77 (3.74)	4.79×10^{-19}	SH stretching	2598[a]
	3025.45 (3.30)	1.63×10^{-18}	CH_3/CH_2 symmetric stretching	2838[a]
	3028.23 (3.30)	4.34×10^{-18}	CH_2 symmetric stretching	2848[a]
	3056.01 (3.27)	1.053×10^{-18}	CH_2 antisymmetric stretching	2945[a]
	3056.83 (3.27)	6.17×10^{-18}	CH_2 symmetric stretching	2960[a]
	3085.19 (3.24)	8.81×10^{-18}	CH_2 antisymmetric stretching	3090[a]
	3091.47 (3.23)	8.41×10^{-18}	CH_3 antisymmetric stretching	
	3105.50 (3.22)	7.11×10^{-18}	CH_2 antisymmetric stretching	3183[a]
2-propanethiol ($Trans$)	225.30 (44.38)	3.70×10^{-18}	SH torsion	185[b]
	230.02 (43.47)	8.50×10^{-20}	CH_3 torsion	230[b]
	254.64 (39.27)	4.23×10^{-21}	CH_3 torsion	245[b]
	323.81 (30.88)	4.81×10^{-19}	CCS bending	325[b]
	333.83 (29.95)	4.51×10^{-20}	CCC bending	
	407.72 (24.52)	5.05×10^{-20}	CCC bending	410[b]
	594.92 (16.80)	2.09×10^{-18}	CS stretching	620[b]
	855.73 (11.68)	1.84×10^{-18}	SH out of plane bending	
	886.90 (11.27)	1.11×10^{-19}	CC stretching	
	938.74 (10.65)	3.70×10^{-20}	CH_3 bending	
	955.04 (10.47)	1.01×10^{-19}	CH_3 bending	
	1101.43 (9.0)	7.39×10^{-18}	CH_3 bending	
	1126.78 (8.87)	3.61×10^{-19}	CC stretching	
	1187.27 (8.42)	1.36×10^{-18}	CH_3 bending	
	1297.52 (7.70)	4.84×10^{-18}	CH out of plane bending	
	1336.78 (7.48)	1.84×10^{-19}	CH bending	
	1400.78 (7.13)	1.39×10^{-18}	CH_3 out of plane bending	
	1416.86 (7.05)	7.64×10^{-19}	CH_3 out of plane bending	
	1476.26 (6.77)	5.41×10^{-21}	CH_3 deformation	
	1479.59 (6.75)	9.35×10^{-19}	CH_3 deformation	
	1488.11 (6.71)	3.01×10^{-18}	CH_3 deformation	
	1493.55 (6.69)	1.64×10^{-18}	CH_3 deformation	
	2666.62 (3.75)	5.06×10^{-19}	SH stretching	
	3021.65 (3.30)	4.78×10^{-18}	CH_3 symmetric stretchin	
	3027.43 (3.30)	8.42×10^{-18}	CH_3 symmetric stretching	
	3050.92 (3.27)	7.52×10^{-19}	CH stretching	
	3078.79 (3.24)	8.99×10^{-20}	CH_3 antisymmetric stretching	
	3086.86 (3.23)	1.50×10^{-17}	CH_3 antisymmetric stretching	
	3107.55 (3.21)	5.08×10^{-18}	CH_3 antisymmetric stretching	
	3109.97 (3.21)	7.21×10^{-18}	CH_3 antisymmetric stretching	

[a] Torgrimsen & Klaeboe (1970) and references therein. [b] Smith et al. (1968) from experiment

TABLE 6
Rotational, quartic and sextic centrifugal distortion constants of 1-propanethiol and 2-propanethiol

Species	**Rotational constants with equilibrium (e) & ground vibrational state (0) geometry**	**Values in MHz with DFT(HF) method**	**Experimentally obtained ground-state values in MHz**	**Distortional constants**	**Values in KHz with DFT(HF) method**
	A_e	24213.642(24429.75)		Δ_J	0.296911(0.208512)
	B_e	2312.864(2337.88)		Δ_K	214.57798(618.4248)
	C_e	2222.041(2245.40)		Δ_{JK}	29.811(42.2776)
				δ_1	-0.0455(-0.039844)
	A_0	23239.81(23632.75)	23429.0	δ_2	0.4518(9.96033)
	B_0	2301.32(2328.06)	2345.29	Φ_J	-0.90726×10^{-08}(-0.2571×10^{-07})
1-propanethiol (Tg)	C_0	2199.16(2226.75)	2250.18	Φ_K	0.419723×10^{-02}(0.45931×10^{-01})
				Φ_{JK}	0.153284×10^{-04}(0.48892×10^{-05})
				Φ_{KJ}	0.863327×10^{-03}(0.40468×10^{-02})
				ϕ_J	-0.454229×10^{-07}(-0.20575×10^{-07})
				ϕ_K	0.194759×10^{-02}(0.11375×10^{-02})
				ϕ_{JK}	0.557817×10^{-05}(0.31203×10^{-08})
	A_e	7886.965(7938.21)		Δ_J	1.246(1.043)
	B_e	4341.565(4399.57)		Δ_K	6.799(5.473)
	C_e	3118.889(3152.54)		D_{JK}	2.184(3.312)
				δ_1	3.728(0.265)
	A_0	7782.14(7841.42)	7892.65	δ_2	0.3805(1.933)
	B_0	4306.51(4366.93)	4414.42	Φ_J	0.108001×10^{-07}(0.15733×10^{-06})
2-propanethiol ($trans$)	C_0	3087.77(3124.21)	3158.03	Φ_K	0.144633×10^{-04}(0.54329×10^{-05})
				Φ_{JK}	0.562981×10^{-05}(0.13656×10^{-05})
				Φ_{KJ}	0.115468×10^{-04}(0.19811×10^{-05})
				ϕ_J	0.818191×10^{-07}(0.71495×10^{-07})
				ϕ_K	0.503435×10^{-05}(0.10983×10^{-04})
				ϕ_{JK}	0.439650×10^{-05}(0.12349×10^{-05})

[k] Kisiel et al. (2010), [l] Griffith & Boggs (1975)

TABLE 7
Dipole moments of alcohols and their thiol analogues by using HF/6-31G(d). Experimental values are given within the bracket.

	Dipole moment components in Debye			
Species	μ_a	μ_b	μ_c	μ_{Total}
Methanol	-1.5406 (1.44^a)	1.0537 (0.899^a)	0.0	1.8665 (1.69^a)
Methanethiol	1.4683(1.312^b)	1.0152(0.758^b)	-0.0001	1.7851(1.51^b)
Ethanol	-0.0541(0.046^c)	1.7374(1.438^c)	0.0000	1.78383^{HF},1.53^{DFT}(1.441^c)
Ethanethiol	0.0431(1.06^d)	1.8597(1.17^d)	0.00	1.8602 (1.50^d)
1-propanol (Gt)	0.8018,0.574^x (0.32^{e1},0.4914^{e2})	1.0022, 1.086^x(1.23^{e1},0.9705^{e2})	1.0743, 0.922^x(0.94^{e1},0.9042^{e2})	1.6737, 1.53^x(1.58^{e1},1.4145^{e2})
1-propanethiol (Tg)	1.7638	-0.0840	0.8186	1.9463(1.6^f)
2-propanol ($gauche$)	-1.2070(1.114^g)	-0.7023(0.737^g)	0.9868(0.8129^g)	1.9163(1.56^g)
2-propanethiol ($trans$)	0.4034	1.8685	0.00	1.9115 (1.61^f)

[a]Ivash & Dennison (1953), [b]Tsunekawa et al. (1989), [c]Takano et al. (1968), [d]Schmidt & Quade (1975), [e]Abdurakhmanov et al. (1970), [f]Lide (2001), [g]Hirota (1979), [x]calculation at MP2/cc-pVTZ level.

stretching band respectively with the integral absorbance coefficient of 8.81×10^{-18} and 8.41×10^{-18} cm molecule^{-1} respectively. Most intense band of 2-propanethiol belongs to 3.25 μm (3078.79 cm^{-1}) which corresponds to the integral absorbance coefficient of 1.50×10^{-17} cm molecule^{-1}.

Figure 4 shows isotopic variation of vibrational spectra of 1-propanethiol. We show isotopic variation by changing the mass of carbon ($C = 12$ and 13 isotopic mass) and sulfur atoms ($S = 32$ and 34 isotopic mass). The result shows that bending mode and stretching modes are shifted towards lower wavenumbers. CS stretching for $CH_3CH_2{}^{12}CH_2{}^{32}SH$ mode with wavenumber 700.4 cm^{-1} is shifted to 698.01 cm^{-1}, CH_2 wagging mode having wavenumber 1271.69 cm^{-1} is shifted to 1265.14 cm^{-1} and CH_2 antisymmetric stretching with wavenumber 3111.92 cm^{-1} is shifted to the wavenumber 3101.18 cm^{-1} due to change of isotopic mass of a carbon atom of CH_2 group ($CH_3CH_2{}^{13}CH_2{}^{32}SH$).

4.2. *Rotational Spectroscopy*

Till date, most of the species are observed in the interstellar medium or circumstellar shells by their rotational transitions. Chakrabarti et al. (2015); Majumdar, Das & Chakrabarti (2014a,b); Majumdar et al. (2013a, 2012) pointed out the need for theoretical calculations for firm identification of some unknown species in the ISM. Species which have permanent dipole moments show their rotational transitions. Here, we compute various rotational parameters



FIG. 3.— Time evolution of monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues in isothermal and warm-up phase.

TABLE 8
EXPECTED INTENSITY RATIO BY ASSUMING THE SAME COLUMN DENSITY AND ROTATIONAL TEMPERATURE.

	ratio
$\frac{\text{Ethanol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.435
$\frac{\text{1-Propanol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.181
$\frac{\text{2-Propanol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.179
$\frac{\text{Methanethiol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	1.163
$\frac{\text{Ethanethiol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.249
$\frac{\text{1-Propanethiol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.116
$\frac{\text{2-Propanethiol}}{\text{Methanol}}$	0.111

(for equilibrium structure as well as ground vibrational state) for 1-propanethiol and 2-propanethiol. Here, we have employed B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ and HF/cc-pVTZ method in Gaussian 09 program. Aug prefix basis set is used here to mean that the basis set is augmented with diffusion function and cc-pVTZ is Dunning correlation consistent basis sets (Kendall et al. 1992) having triple zeta function. This basis set has its redundant functions removed and is rotated (Davidson 1996) in order to increase computational efficiency. Accuracy depends on the choice of the method and basis sets used. Anharmonic vibrational-rotational coupling analysis is computed using the second order (numerical differentiation) perturbative anharmonic analysis. Quartic rotation-vibration coupling is included in rotational parameters calculations. Calculated rotational and distortional constants are shown in Table 6 to compare with some existing results. It is to be noted that the existing experimental results which are pointed out in Table 6



FIG. 4.— Isotopic variation of infrared spectra of 1-propanethiol.

were for the ground vibrational state.

Various components of dipole moments are computed for all the alcohols and their thiols considered in this study. In Table 7, we compare our calculated dipole moment components with the existing theoretical or experimental results. Previous studies found that calculations at the HF level would predict dipole moment components close to the experimental values. Thus, we use HF/6-31g(d) level of theory for this computation. It is expected that these complex molecules could be detected in hot core regions. Charnley et al. (1995) pointed out that for an optically thin emission, an idea about the antenna temperature could be made by calculating the intensity of a given transition. This intensity is proportional to $\frac{\mu^2}{Q(T_{rot})}$, where μ is the electric dipole moment and $Q(T_{rot})$ is the partition function at rotational temperature T_{rot}. In Table 8, we compare the intensities for all the species with respect to methanol. For the computation of $Q(T_{rot})$, we use $\sqrt{T^3/(ABC)}$. Rotational constants of these species are taken from earlier studies (Takano et al. 1968; Ohashi et al. 1977; Hirota 1979; Sastry et al. 1986; Lucia, Herbst & Anderson 1989; Kisiel et al. 2010; Müller et al. 2015; Griffith & Boggs 1975). Here, we assume that all these species bear the same column density and rotational temperature. Since we are aiming to study these molecules around hot core regions, we are using $T = 180$K for this calculation. All these ratios are shown in Table 8. Very nice correlation is seen as we going to higher order alcohols/thiols. The spectral intensities , along with the frequencies for rotational transitions of 1-propanethiol and 2-propanethiol in the sub-millimeter regime are predicted by using quantum chemical calculations followed by the SPCAT program (Pickett 1991). For this calculations, we use the experimentally obtained constants from Table 6 and use experimentally obtained dipole moments from Table 7. We prepare this catalog files in JPL format and this files are given as supplementary materials with this article.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we study the formation of monohydric alcohols and their thiols. Major highlights of our work are as follows.

• In between various conformational isomers, it is essential to find out the most stable conformer which might be a viable candidate for astronomical detections. Here, we carried out potential energy surface scan to find out the most stable isomer of the monohydric alcohols and their thiol analogues. Among the alcohols, methanol, ethanol and 1-propanol have been claimed to be detected in the ISM whereas in thiols, methanethiol and ethanethiol were claimed to be detected in hot core regions. In between alcohols, 2-propanol and in between thiols, 1-propanethiol and 2-propanethiol are yet to be detected in any sources. Our calculations find that *gauche*, Tg and *trans* conformer is the most stable isomer for 2-propanol, 1-propanethiol and 2-propanethiol respectively.

• Reaction pathways in forming all stable isomers of monohydric alcohols and their thiols are prepared to study the chemical evolution.

• Our study reveals that around the warmer region ($T > 120$ K), 1-propanethiol would be a viable candidate for astronomical detection in the gas phase.

• Since 1-propanethiol is yet to be detected in space, we carried out quantum chemical calculation to study various spectral aspects (in IR and sub-mm) of this species. Band assignments were done for its various modes of vibration. Changes of absorbance spectra due to the isotopic effects were also pointed out. Moreover, we find out rotational and distortional constants of this species and compare with existing experimental results. Experimentally obtained constants and our calculated dipole moment components are further utilized to predict various probable transitions which should be useful for the future detection of this species in the ISM.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

PG is grateful to DST (Grant No. SB/S2/HEP-021/2013) for the partial financial support. AD and SKC want to acknowledge ISRO respond project (Grant No. ISRO/RES/2/402/16-17). EEE acknowledges a research fellowship from the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore. Amaresh Das acknowledges the partial support of Inidian Centre for Space Physics.

REFERENCES

Allamandola, L. J., Sandford, S. A., & Tielens, A. G. G. M., 1992., ApJ, 399, 134
Allen, M., & Robinson, G. W., 1977., ApJ, 212, 396
Abdurakhmanov, A. A., Ragimova, R. A., & Imanov, L. M., 1970, PhL, 32A, 123
Abdurakhmanov, A. A., & Ismailzade, G. I. 1984, Zh. Strukturnoi Khimii, 1987, 28, 91 (English transl. in J. Struct. Chem., 28, 238)
Biham, O., Furman, I., Pirronello, V., & Vidali, G., 2001, ApJ 553, 595
Becke, A. D., 1988, PhRvA, 386, 3098
Boogert, A. C. A., Schutte, W. A., Helmich, F. P., Tielens, A. G. G. M., & Wooden D. H., 1997, A&A, 317, 929
Cazaux, S., Cobut, V., Marseille, M., Spaans, M., & Caselli, P., 2010, A&A, 522, 74
Caselli, P., Stantcheva, T., Shalabiea, O., Shematovich, V. I. & Herbst, E., 2002, P&SS,50, 1257
Chakrabarti, S. K., Das, A., Acharyya, K., & Chakrabarti, S., 2006, A&A, 457, 167
Chakrabarti, S. K., Das, A., Acharyya, K., & Chakrabarti, S., 2006, BASI, 34, 299
Chakrabarti, S. K., Majumdar, S. K., Das, A., & Chakrabarti, S., 2015, Ap&SS, 357, 90
Choi, S., Kang, T. T., Choi, K. W., Han, S., Ahn, D. S., Baek, S. J., & Kim, S. K., 2008, JPhCh A, 112, 7191
Cuppen, H., & Herbst, E., 2007, ApJ, 668, 294
Charnley, S. B., Kress, M. E., Tielens, A. G. G. M., & Millar, T. J., 1995, ApJ, 448, 232
Das, A., Chakrabarti, S. K., Acharyya, K., & Chakrabarti, S., 2008b, NewA, 13, 457
Das, A., Acharyya, K., Chakrabarti, S., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2008a, A&A, 486, 209
Das, A., Acharyya, K., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2010, MNRAS 409, 789
Das, A., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2011, 418. 545, MNRAS
Das, A., Majumdar, L., Chakrabarti, S. K., & Chakrabarti S., 2013a, NewA, 23, 118
Das, A., Majumdar, L., Chakrabarti, S. K., Saha, R., & Chakrabarti, S., 2013b, MNRAS, 433, 3152
Das, A., Majumdar, L., Chakrabarti, S. K., & Sahu, D., 2015a, NewA, 35, 53
Das, A., Majumdar, L., Sahu, D., Gorai, P., Sivaraman, B., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2015b, ApJ, 808, 21
Das, A., Sahu, D., Majumdar, L., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2016, MNRAS, 455, 540
Davidson, E. R., CPL, 1996, 260, 514-18.
Druard, C., & Wakelam, V., 2012, MNRAS, 426, 354
Ferrante, R. F., Moore, M. H., Spiliotis, M. M., & Hudson, R. L., 2008, ApJ, 684, 1210
Foresman, J.B., & Frisch, A., 1995-96, Exploring Chemistry with Electronic structure, Gaussian, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 15106 USA
Frisch, M. J. et al., 2009, Ins. Wallingford CT, Gaussian 09, Revision E.01
Garrod, R.T., & Herbst, E., 2006, A&A, 457, 927
Garrod, R. T., 2013, ApJ, 765, 60
Garozzo, M., Fulvio, D., Kanuchova, Z., Palumbo M. E., & Strazzulla, G., 2010, A&A, 509, A67
Gibb, E. L., Whittet, D. C. B., Boogert, A. C. A. & Tielens, A. G. G. M., 2004, ApJS, 151, 35
Griffith, J. H., & Boggs, J. E., 1975, JMoSp, 56, 257
Hasegawa, T., & Herbst, E., 1993, MNRAS, 261, 83.
Hasegawa, T., Herbst, E., & Leung, C. M., 1992, ApJ, 82, 167
Howk, J. C., Sembach, K. R., & Savage, B. D., 2006, ApJ, 637, 333
Hirota, E., 1979a, JPhCh, 83, 1457
Hirota, E., 1979, JPhCh, 83, 1457
Ivash, E. V., & Dennison, D. M., 1953, JChPh, 21, 1804
Jansen, D. J., Spaans, M., Hogerheijde, M. R., & van Dishoeck, E. F., 1995, A&A, 303, 541
Johansson, L. E. B., Andersson, C., Elldér, J., et al., 1984, A&A 130, 227.
Kendall, R. A., Dunning, Jr.T. H., & Harrison. R. J., JChPh, 1992, 96
Kisiel, Z., Dorosh, O., Maeda, A., et al. 2010, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., 12, 8329
Kolesniková, L., Tercero, B., Cernicharo, J., et al. 2014, ApJ, 784, L7
Leung, C.M., Herbst, E., & Huebner, W.F., 1984. ApJS, 56, 231
Lide, D. R., 2001, CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 82th ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, Section 10
Lotta, T., Murto, J., Rasanen, M., & Aspala, A. 1984, Chem. Phys., 86, 105
Lee, C., Yang, W., & Parr, R. G., 1988, PhRvB, 58, 785
Linke, R. A., Frerking, M. A., & Thaddeus, P., 1979, ApJ, 234, L139
Lucia, F. C. D., Herbst, E., & Anderson, T., 1989, JMoSp, 134, 395
Maeda, A., Lucia, F. C. D., Herbst, E., et al., 2006, ApJ, 162, 428
Majumdar, L., Das, A., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2014a, A&A, 562, A56
Majumdar, L., Das, A., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2014b, ApJ, 782, 73
Majumdar, L., Das, A., Chakrabarti, S. K., & Chakrabarti, S., 2013, New Astronomy, 20, 15
Majumdar, L., Das, A., Chakrabarti, S. K., & Chakrabarti, S., 2012, RAA, 12, 1613
Majumdar, L., Gratier, P., Vidal, T., Wakelam, V., Loison, J. C., Hickson, K. M., & Caux, E, 2016, MNRAS, 458, 1859
Millar, T. J., & Herbst, E., 1990, A&A, 231, 466
Millar, T.J., Olofsson, H., Hjalmarson, A., Brown, P.D., 1988, A&A, 205, L5
Müller, H. S. P., Belloche, A., Xu, Li-Hong., et al. A&A, 2015.
Ohashi, O., Ohnishi. M., Tagui, A., Sakaizumi, T., & Yamaguchi, Ichiro., 1977, Chemical society of japan 50, 1749

Palumbo, M. E., Tielens, A. G. G. M., & Tokunaga, A. T., 1995, ApJ, 449, 674
Palumbo, M. E., Geballe T. R., & Tielens, A. G. G. M., 1997, ApJ, 479, 839
Paul, M. Woods., A. Occhiogrosso., S. Viti., Z. Kanuchov a., M. E. Palumbo & S. D. Pric, 2014, MNRAS, 000, 1
Peterson, K. A., & Dunning, T. H., 2002, JChPh, 117, 10548.
Pickett, H. M., JMoSp, 1991, 148, 371
Quan, D., Herbst, E., Corby, J., Durr, A., & Hassel, G., 2016, ApJ, 824, 129
Requena-Torres, M. A., Martin-Pintado. J., Martin. S., & Morris. M. R., ApJ , 2008, 672, 352.
Sahu, D., Das, A., Majumdar, L., & Chakrabarti, S. K., 2015, NewA, 38, 23
Scappini, F., Cecchi-Pestellini C., Smith H., Klemperer W., & Dalgarno A., 2003, MNRAS, 341, 657
Swings, P., & Rosenfeld, L. ApJ, 1937, 86, 483S.
Savage, B. D., & Sembach, K. R., 1996, ARA&A, 34, 279
Sastry, K. V. L. N., Herbst, E., Booker, A. R., & Lucia, F. C. D., 1986, JMoSp, 116, 120-135
Schmidt, R. E., & Quade, C. R. 1975, JChPh, 62, 3864
Smith, D., Devlin, J. P., & Scott, D. W. 1968, JMoSp, 25, 174-184
Sofia, U. J., Cardelli, J. A., & Savage, B. D., 1994, ApJ, 430, 650
Takano, M., Sasada, Y., & Satoh, T., 1968, JMoSp, 26, 157-162
Tielens, A. G. G. M., Allamandola, L. J., 1987b. In: Hollenbach, D. J., & Thronson, H.A., 1987 (Eds.), Interstellar Process. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 397.
Tercero, B., Cernicharo, J., & López et al., 2015, A&A, 582, L1
Tielens, A. G. G. M., & Allamandola, L. J., 1987a, in physical process in interstellar clouds, ed. N. Kaifu (Tokyo: Univ. Tokyo Press), 237
Tsunekawa, S., Taniguchi, I., Tambo, A., et al. 1989, JMoSp, 134, 63
Tieftrunk, A., Pineau des Forets G., Schilke P., & Walmsley C. M., 1994, A&A, 289, 579
Torgrimsen, T., Klaeboe, P., et al., 1970, Acta Chemica Scandinavica., 24, 1139-1144
Turner, B. E., 1991, ApJs, 76, 617
Turner, B. E., 1977, ApJ, 213, L75
Woods, P. M., Occhiogrosso, A., Viti, S., Kauchov, Z., Palumbo, M. E., & Price, S. D., 2015, MNRAS, 450, 1256
Woodall, J., Agndez, M., Markwick-Kemper, A. J., & Millar, T. J. 2007, A&A, 466, 1197